4.2 Faculty Policies and Procedures. The program shall have well-defined policies and procedures to recruit, appoint and promote qualified faculty, to evaluate competence and performance of faculty, and to support the professional development and advancement of faculty.

a. **A faculty handbook or other written document that outlines faculty rules and regulations.**

The CEOMPH program itself does not have its own faculty rules and regulations. Because of its consortial nature, the program is limited to abiding by the faculty rules and regulations in place at each partner institution. However, a "Faculty Information and Resources" web page is available on the CEOMPH website so that faculty can access information specific to CEOMPH. This web page is a collection of information given to faculty over the years on appointments, the Intra-Partner Research Program, interactive videoconferencing tips, learning management system manuals, etc. The web page is located at http://mph.neomed.edu/faculty-and-staff/faculty-resources

In order to establish a faculty "identity," CEOMPH has developed its own program-specific faculty appointment process. Appendix 4.2.a. is the application and process for faculty appointment. In order to be eligible for appointment as faculty within the CEOMPH, a faculty member must first be appointed and maintain graduate faculty status at one of the partner universities: The University of Akron, Cleveland State University, NEOMED, Ohio University, or Youngstown State University. "Regular" faculty members are those who are engaged in both teaching and service/research in the program; "Adjunct" faculty are those who are engaged either in teaching or service or research in the program.

All new faculty appointments to the program are recommended by the Faculty Appointments and Development Committee to the CEOMPH Governing Council, after extensive review of the faculty curriculum vita. New core course director appointments are made by the Program Coordinating Council (again, with Faculty Appointments and Development Committee curriculum vita review).

Each program partner has procedures in place to recruit and appoint faculty, and then to provide ongoing evaluation of faculty performance. These procedures are outlined in each institution's appointment, promotion, and tenure policies, which are provided to faculty in each institution's faculty handbook.

Each participating institution's faculty handbook (or similar document) is included as an appendix to this criterion. In addition, the following institutions provide faculty rules and resources related to this criterion on their websites:

Table 4.2.a. Institution faculty rules and regulations

Institution	Website Regarding Faculty Rules and Resources
UA	http://www.uakron.edu/dotAsset/1023268.pdf
CSU	http://www.csuohio.edu/offices/teachingexcellence/handbook/
NEOMED	http://www.neomed.edu/officesanddirectory/facultyaffairs/frequentlyusedlinks
OU	http://www.ohio.edu/facultysenate/handbook/current-handbook.cfm
YSU	http://cms.ysu.edu/administrative-offices/university-policies/university-policies

b. **Description of provisions for faculty development, including identification of support for faculty categories other than regular full-time appointments**.

CEOMPH offers faculty development on different levels. The MPH office provides one-on-one instruction for faculty (including adjunct) on using the learning management system and the interactive videoconference system. In addition, the program director offers feedback, as

necessary, to faculty during the semester, based on observation (the program director is present during interactive videoconferencing classes) and student verbal input.

Each partner institution also devotes time and resources to the development of all faculty members within their respective campuses. Table 4.2.b. below lists the programs and support for faculty on each partner campus.

Table 4.2. b. Institution provisions for faculty

Institution	Faculty Development Provisions
UA	The Institute for Teaching and Learning (http://www3.uakron.edu/itl/) promotes, coordinates, and supports faculty efforts to improve, assess, and document teaching effectiveness and student learning quality and to advance and disseminate the scholarship of teaching, assessment, and learning.
CSU	**The Center for Teaching Excellence** was established to promote and encourage a culture of excellence in teaching and learning at Cleveland State University. https://www.csuohio.edu/offices/teachingexcellence/
NEOMED	The Office of Faculty Relations and Professional Development serves as NEOMED's central faculty services office to provide continuous support to faculty through the duration of their career with NEOMED**.** http://www.neomed.edu/officesanddirectory/facultyservices/programs
OU	The Office of Faculty Development prepares and assists faculty for current and future roles in osteopathic medical education**.** https://www.ohio.edu/medicine/about/offices/academic-affairs/faculty-development/index.cfm The Center for Teaching & Learning (CTL) works collaboratively with university colleagues to enhance the connection between teaching and learning. https://www.ohio.edu/ctl/teaching-learning-resources/faculty-resources.html
YSU	The Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) provides opportunities and resources for faculty enrichment across the university. All activities are sponsored through the Office of the Provost. The Center provides orientation for new faculty, and faculty transitioning to new positions, ongoing faculty mentoring, faculty preparation toward tenure, promotion, awards, and grants, support of scholarship and creative activities, best practices in teaching and learning, and associated technologies, and support in achieving job satisfaction, and life/work balance. http://cms.ysu.edu/teaching-and-learning-center/teaching-and-learning-center

c.   Description of formal procedures for evaluating faculty competence and performance.

Faculty are primarily evaluated by their own universities through their home departments, since primary appointments are made through one of the partner institutions. Most of the formal evaluation the program performs is of teaching, which is described in the next section. Informally, the program director sits in during classes, and provides advice to individual faculty on more effective uses of the interactive videoconferencing system or the online learning management system.

Each program partner provides for a careful and extensive review process for their own respective faculty. Information regarding formal procedures for evaluating faculty competence and performance can be viewed from the following websites for each partner institution.

Table 4.2.c. Institution faculty evaluation

Institution	Websites Describing Faculty Competence and Performance
UA	Non-tenured faculty are reviewed annually by their departments under individual academic unit criteria that must include research, teaching and service dimensions. These criteria as well as recommendations for retention made using them are reviewed and approved by the respective college deans and the provost. The University of Akron also has a Graduate Faculty appointment process whose primary purpose is to ensure the quality of faculty participating in Graduate programs. Faculty must meet and sustain defined levels of research productivity in order to be appointed to the Graduate Faculty. After the initial appointment, graduate faculty status is renewed every five years if productivity standards have been met. Initial appointments and renewals are based on recommendation from the faculty-based Graduate Council. http://www.uakron.edu/ogc/UniversityRules/?tabId=tab1113634&search_value=evaluating+faculty (see document 3359-20-03.1)
CSU	Evaluations are performed yearly by department chairs. The report includes **sections for** teaching, scholarly activities, and service to the university and community. The amount for each component is based on a faculty development plan. Guidelines for evaluating faculty competence and guidance is highlighted in the *Faculty Personnel Policies*. https://www.csuohio.edu/compliance/faculty-personnel-policies
NEOMED	Faculty are given an annual evaluation from the Departmental Chair. The evaluation is based on teaching, research and service goals that are established each year. The weightings of each element vary from faculty to faculty. The Departmental Chair then forwards the evaluations to the President and Dean of the College of Medicine. http://www.neomed.edu/officesanddirectory/facultyservices/appointments-promotion-tenure-and-evaluation The Faculty Handbook includes the faculty bylaws, appointment procedures and other faculty documents.
OU	All graduate faculty are evaluated yearly regarding their performance in areas of teaching, service, and scholarship. Such evaluation is conducted for summative purposes (e.g., merit salary reviews) and formative purposes (probationary/pre-tenure review, career development). Specific evaluation mechanisms differ across the participating institutions, but all contain elements of peer review, student evaluation of instruction, and administrative assessment of accomplishments in the key areas under review. Additionally, many faculty are active clinicians (physicians and other public health professionals) and, as such, must engage in continuing professional development as clinicians to maintain their professional credentials. One's continuity of credentialing is often a requirement for continued employment. https://www.ohio.edu/chsp/documents/upload/02-policy-chsp-annual-faculty-performance-may-2013.pdf
YSU	At Youngstown State University faculty evaluation is determined by agreement with the faculty union. The process is based on student evaluations of faculty teaching (which takes place every semester prior to tenure and on an agreed upon schedule of review for tenured faculty) and a formal chairpersons review, which may include classroom observation. Chairs review non-tenured faculty annually and tenured faculty every other year. Tenured Full Professors are evaluated every four years. Chairperson reviews cover Teaching, Scholarship, and Service and standards and expectations for tenure and promotion are set by the contract and governance documents established in each department and college. http://cms.ysu.edu/administrative-offices/human-resources/chairperson-instructions

d. **Description of the processes used for student course evaluation and evaluation of instructional effectiveness**.

All core courses and faculty are assessed on their MPH teaching through end of the semester course evaluations every semester. The program office sends students a link to an online survey. These evaluations are reviewed by the Faculty Appointments and Development Committee and the Curriculum Committee. Recommendations are forwarded to the appropriate party (course director or Program Coordinating Council). In general, the goal is to achieve weighted averages of 3.0 or greater or at least increasing trends toward this goal. In cases of consistently negative comments or poor ratings, the program director discusses how the faculty might improve their performance.

Graduating students are asked for their overall assessment of the program's faculty as part of the graduate exit survey. In addition, current students are surveyed annually on how well faculty assist in the class, provide valuable learning experiences, and enhance learning of public health. Appendix 4.4.c contains survey results. Finally, students are asked to provide their assessment of program preceptors (both academic faculty and community-based preceptors) used to facilitate the completion of their capstone project.

Course evaluations for the last three years are in Appendix 4.2.d. All of the core course evaluations have the same format—student ratings of course objectives, general course questions, faculty ratings, achievement of competencies, anticipated grade, and comments. Students do not consistently fill out elective course evaluations, but they do provide a description and assessment of all electives in their portfolios. An incentive is offered to the winner of a random drawing if 80% of the class fills out the course evaluation.

e. **Assessment of the extent to which this criterion is met and an analysis of the program's strengths, weaknesses and plans relating to this criterion.**

This criterion is met. Program faculty have well-defined policies and opportunities for development. Faculty performance in the program are defined and reviewed.

Strengths: Each university has faculty policies for advancement and development. The program centralizes course evaluation functions.

Weaknesses: While the program can advise faculty on teaching, the faculty report to their department chairs. It is unknown if chairs value faculty contributions to CEOMPH. Whether incentive to participate in CEOMPH might or might not exist, students are generally pleased with the quality of teaching they receive.

Plan: The program will continue to assist faculty with development and assistance with technology and teaching and make participation in the program enjoyable.